



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,838	02/26/2004	Ravishankar Ramanathan	50277-2293	8231

42425 7590 05/17/2007  
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE  
2055 GATEWAY PLACE  
SUITE 550  
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER
----------

GORTAYO, DANGELINO N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/17/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/789,838	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAMANATHAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dangelino N. Gortayo	<b>Art Unit</b> 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                            |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                           | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. In the amendment filed on 2/14/07, claims 1 and 9-16 have been amended. Claims 17-20 have been added. The currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1-20.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cannon et al. (US Patent 7,062,541 B1)

**As per claim 1,** Cannon teaches "A method of migrating objects from a source installation to a target installation," (see Abstract)

"comprising: receiving input that selects a set of migrating objects, wherein the set of migrating objects is a set of objects at the source installation that are to be migrated to the target installation;" (Figure 5 reference 104, 105 and column 11 lines 11-22, wherein a request to transfer data objects is received by the source server)

Art Unit: 2168

"from a first set of one or more system tables at the source installation, copying metadata that defines the selected set of migrating objects into a first set of transport tables at the source installation;" (column 7 lines 43-63, column 10 line 64 – column 11 line 22, wherein an object transfer table is generated specifying attributes about objects to be transferred from an objects attributes table)

"exporting the metadata from the first set of transport tables at the source installation;" (column 11 lines 23-40, lines 56-65, wherein a source server transfers attribute data)

"importing the metadata that was exported from the first set of transport tables into a second set of transport tables at the target installation site;" (column 9 line 56 – column 10 line 13, column 12 lines 9-24, lines 50-60, wherein a target site receives attribute data from a source server and an import groups table is updated)

"merging the metadata from the second set of transport tables into a second set of one or more system tables at the target installation." (Figure 6, column 10 lines 25-37, lines 47-50, column 12 line 25 – column 13 line 17, wherein attributes are merged with data from the target server's object attributes table)

"and migrating the set of migrating objects into the target installation" (column 13 lines 17-36, wherein data objects are transferred to the target site and stored based on object attribute data)

**As per claim 2, Cannon teaches** "the step of exporting includes creating a dump file by invoking an export utility of a database server that manages a database

containing the first set of system tables;" (column 7 lines 43-49, column 8 lines 35-53, column 11 lines 36-46 "export application")

"and the step of importing includes copying data from the dump file into the section set of system tables by invoking an import utility of a database server that manages a database containing the second set of system tables." (Figure 3 reference 44, column 8 lines 53-60, column 9 lines 32-52, column 12 lines 28-35, "import application")

**As per claim 3, Cannon** teaches "generating a script file which, when executed in a first mode causes performance of the step of exporting, and when executed in a second mode causes performance of the step of importing." (column 11 lines 11-22, wherein an object transfer list is made to handle exporting and importing of data objects)

**As per claim 4, Cannon** teaches "the objects are application components created for an application by an application design tool associated with the first installation;" (column 8 lines 5-27)

"and after the step merging, accessing the application components using an application design tool associated with the second installation." (column 8 lines 5-27, column 13 lines 38-43)

**As per claim 5, Cannon** teaches "the first set of transport tables are mirrors of the first set of system tables, and include one or more columns in addition to the columns of the first set of system tables." (column 7 lines 50-63, column 8 lines 35-38, column 10 line 64 – column 11 line 22)

**As per claim 6, Cannon** teaches “the second set of transport tables are mirrors of the second set of system tables, and include one or more columns in addition to the columns of the second set of system tables.” (column 8 lines 60-65, column 9 line 56 – column 10 line 12, column 12 lines 25-35)

**As per claim 7, Cannon** teaches “the step of merging includes resolving inconsistencies between metadata being copied into the second set of system tables from the second set of transport tables,” (column 9 line 56 – column 10 line 13, column 12 lines 36-49)

“and metadata that already exists in said second set of system tables.” (column 10 lines 47-50, column 12 lines 50-60)

**As per claim 8, Cannon** teaches “one or more objects in the set of migrating objects have dependencies relative to a set of one or more other objects that have not been selected by the input;” (column 7 line 64 – column 8 line 4, and column 8 lines 11-27)

“the method further comprises the steps of automatically identifying the set of one or more other objects upon which the migrating objects depend;” (column 11 lines 11-15)

“and migrating from the first installation to the second installation the set of other objects along with the set of migrating objects.” (column 11 line 64 – column 12 line 8)

**As per claim 9-16, Cannon** teaches claims 1-8 above. Additionally, Cannon teaches “A computer-readable storage medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions” (column 6 line 59 – column 7 line 4)

**As per claim 17, Cannon** teaches “the one or more system tables at the source installation comprise metadata pertaining to the set of migrating objects, wherein the set of migrating objects were created by an application design tool.” (column 7 lines 50-63, column 8 lines 5-27)

**As per claim 18, Cannon** teaches claim 17 above. Additionally, Cannon teaches “A computer-readable storage medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions” (column 6 line 59 – column 7 line 4)

**As per claim 19, Cannon** teaches “merging the set of migrating objects with pre-existing data in the target installation in accordance with a specified mode that dictates how the set of migrating objects and the pre-existing data are to be reconciled.” (column 9 lines 14-32, column 10 lines 47-50)

**As per claim 20, Cannon** teaches claim 19 above. Additionally, Cannon teaches “A computer-readable storage medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions” (column 6 line 59 – column 7 line 4)

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's amendment, see page 2, filed 2/14/2007, with respect to the rejection of claims 9-16 under 35 USC 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 9-16 under 35 USC 101 has been withdrawn.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 1-20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a. Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-I]

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

- b. Applicant's argument is stated as Cannon does not teach "from a first set of one or more system tables at the source installation, copying metadata that defines the selected set of migrating objects into a first set of transport tables at the source installation;"

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. Cannon, in column 10 line 64 – column 11 line 22, teaches that an object transfer table is generated specifying attributes about objects to be transferred from an objects attributes table. The source server stores object attribute data in object attribute tables, as taught in column 7 lines 43-63, and the object transfer table identifies different attributes specifying object group information, which is stored in the object attributes table. The object attribute table is a persistent table storing attribute information from objects (column 10 line 47-50), and the object transfer



table contains the necessary attribute data to transfer objects between different sources. Therefore, Cannon teaches from a first set of one or more system tables at the source installation, copying metadata that defines the selected set of migrating objects into a first set of transport tables at the source installation.

c. Applicant's argument is stated as Cannon does not teach "the first set of transport tables are mirrors of the first set of system tables, and include one or more columns in addition to the columns of the first set of system tables."

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. As disclosed in column 7 lines 50-63 and column 8 lines 35-38, the source server contains both an object attributes table and an object transfer table. Both contain attribute information about objects to be transferred, with the object transfer table also containing parameters from a user to specify objects (column 10 line 64 – column 11 line 22). In column 11 lines 23-27, the object transfer table is taught to contain the objects to be transferred, as well as attribute data, which can also be found in an object attributes table. Therefore, Cannon teaches the first set of transport tables are mirrors of the first set of system tables, and include one or more columns in addition to the columns of the first set of system tables.

d. Applicant's argument is stated as Cannon does not teach "importing the metadata that was exported from the first set of transport tables into a second set of transport tables at the target installation site;" and "merging the metadata from

the second set of transport tables into a second set of one or more system tables at the target installation.”

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is directed to figure 6, wherein the target site receives object transfers. In column 9 line 56 – column 10 line 13, an imports group table stores attribute data from objects transferred, including identifying groups an object belongs to. Column 12 lines 9-24 and lines 40-60 teach how attributes and group identifiers from a source server are received by the target server and is placed in import group table. Therefore, Cannon teaches importing the metadata that was exported from the first set of transport tables into a second set of transport tables at the target installation site;”

Once again, Figure 6 as examined to how data objects are received by a target server. Column 10 lines 25-37 and lines 47-50 teach the object attribute table in the target server being a persistent table containing attributes. Column 12 line 25 – column 13 line 17 teach how the import group table is used to transfer objects then update data in the object attribute table of the target server. Specifically, flags representing attributes are set in the object attribute table based on received object attribute information. Therefore, Cannon teaches merging the metadata from the second set of transport tables into a second set of one or more system tables at the target installation.

e. Applicant's argument is stated as Cannon does not teach "the second set of transport tables are mirrors of the second set of system tables, and include one or more columns in addition to the columns of the second set of system tables."

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. Column 8 lines 60-65 and column 9 line 56 – column 10 line 12 teach how a target server contains an import group table comprised of fields containing object attributes, specifically group membership information. The import group table is a transient table used for transferring objects, based on the object attribute table, which is more persistent. Column 12 lines 25-35 teach how the import group tables are stored in RAM, making it more temporary, and containing objects and corresponding attributes and group identifiers. Therefore, Cannon teaches the second set of transport tables are mirrors of the second set of system tables, and include one or more columns in addition to the columns of the second set of system tables.

f. Applicant's argument is stated as Cannon does not teach "copying data from the dump file into the section set of system tables by invoking an import utility of a database server that manages a database containing the second set of system tables."

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. Figure 3 reference 44, column 8 lines 53-60, column 9 lines 32-52, and column 12 lines

28-35 teach an import application in a target server that contains modules to manage the database, specifically in regards to object transferring. This import application contains several modules to receive a data transfer of objects from a source, inspect data, process data, and enter data into the target server database. Therefore, Cannon teaches copying data from the dump file into the section set of system tables by invoking an import utility of a database server that manages a database containing the second set of system tables.

g. Applicant's argument is stated as Cannon does not teach "the objects are application components created for an application by an application design tool associated with the first installation;"

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. Column 8 lines 5-27 teach that the objects to be transferred can be one or more sub-files in a group, wherein sub-files can be combined to provide an application with functionality. The sub-files within a group, or the objects within a group, must be installed or used together. As disclosed above, the objects come from a source server, to be transferred to a target server. Therefore, Cannon teaches the objects are application components created for an application by an application design tool associated with the first installation;

h. Applicant's argument is stated as Cannon does not teach "the one or more system tables at the source installation comprise metadata pertaining to the set

of migrating objects, wherein the set of migrating objects were created by an application design tool.”

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. Column 7 lines 50-63 and column 8 lines 5-27 teach how object attributes table in a source server contain attribute data about objects in groups that require objects in a group to be together for functionality. The objects are split into groups, and group identification is contained within data in an object attributes table. Therefore, Cannon teaches the one or more system tables at the source installation comprise metadata pertaining to the set of migrating objects, wherein the set of migrating objects were created by an application design tool.

i. Applicant’s argument is stated as Cannon does not teach “merging the set of migrating objects with pre-existing data in the target installation in accordance with a specified mode that dictates how the set of migrating objects and the pre-existing data are to be reconciled.”

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. Column 9 lines 14-32 and column 10 lines 47-50 teach that a target server contains an import application composed of various programming modules to accept transferred objects. One module is an inspection module that dictates how objects are to be completed, or “resolved”. Therefore, Cannon teaches merging the set of migrating objects with pre-existing data in the target installation in

accordance with a specified mode that dictates how the set of migrating objects and the pre-existing data are to be reconciled.

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dangelino N. Gortayo whose telephone number is (571)272-7204. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim T. Vo can be reached on (571)272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2168

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dangelino N. Gortayo  
Examiner

Tim T. Vo  
SPE

02



TIM VO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100